

they would find it indispensable to go home. And thus would the Convention be left without a quorum. He hoped they would now go to work in earnest, and try to make a Constitution which, when submitted to the people, would be accepted by them.

The question being taken, resulted as follows:

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Blakistone, Dent, Sellman, Brent, of Charles, Bell, Lloyd, Dickinson, Colston, Hicks, Chambers, of Cecil, McLane, McMaster, Gaither, Biser, Annan, Sappington, Stephenson, Magraw, Nelson, Gwinn, Stewart, of Baltimore city, Sherwood, of Baltimore city, Ware, Flery, John Newcomer, Harbine, Michael Newcomer, Davis, Brewer, Weber, Holliday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Cockey and Brown—36.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Howard, Buchanan, Ridgely, James U. Dennis, Crisfield, Dashiell, Williams, Hodson, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Miller, Spencer, Wright, Hearn, Dirickson, Fooks, Jacobs, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Brent, of Baltimore city, Schley, Neill, Anderson and Smith—39.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. Hicks then withdrew his substitute.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the order as offered by Mr. Michael Newcomer.

Mr. THAWLEY moved to amend the order by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "half-past one," and by striking out "four" and inserting "three."

Determined in the negative.

Mr. THAWLEY moved the question be taken by yeas and nays;

Which motion was not sustained.

The question then recurred and was taken on the adoption of the order; and

Determined in the negative.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, gave notice that on to-morrow he should move to take up for consideration the motion made by him on the 7th of March, to the report of the Legislative committee, being a motion to reconsider the vote of the Convention in relation to the oath to be administered to officers and witnesses.

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, said he yesterday informed the House he should this morning call up the motion to reconsider the representation question. During the recess he had been requested to defer it on account of the absence, to-day, of a number of gentlemen who were anxious to participate in the action of the Convention on that subject, and in deference to their wishes he had consented to postpone it till Thursday—to-morrow. While on the floor he would express the objects he proposed, that every member might be prepared to act.

He had no concealment to practice on this or any other occasion, and desired now, as he always had endeavored to do, to pursue a fair, open, and candid course. It was his purpose first to obtain a reduction in the number of delegates allowed by the bill as it now stands to the city

of Baltimore; to reduce that number to the amount allowed to the largest county. Then to obtain an additional member for each of the counties of Montgomery and Charles, which he thought it could be shown did not receive at present proportionate justice, and, failing in the attempt thus to reduce the delegation from Baltimore, he should endeavor to district the city and require one delegate to be elected in each of such districts.

Mr. HOWARD gave notice that on to-morrow he should move to amend the 22d rule, by adding the following:

"But no motion shall be in order to reconsider an article or section which has gone to the Revisory committee."

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

The Convention then resumed the consideration of the order of the day, being the report No. 13, submitted by Mr. Bowie, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The question pending before the Convention on yesterday, being on the motion of Mr. Brown to reconsider the vote of the Convention on the amendment offered by Mr. Morgan to the 13th section of the report, and adopted by the Convention, striking out the first paragraph of the section.

Mr. BLAKISTONE said it would be remembered that the contest before the Convention at this time was about the number of judges Baltimore city was to be entitled to in the court. He understood a system had been adopted by which the State was to be laid off into judicial districts. That district from which he came was composed of St. Mary's, Charles and Prince George's counties. And he believed that was the rule which had been adopted, making three counties a district, with the exception of the two counties of Frederick and Carroll, and Washington and Allegany, being districts of two counties each, and Calvert, Anne Arundel, Montgomery and Howard counties, the four making a district, and perhaps the same number in a district on the Eastern Shore. The gentleman, (Mr. Gwinn,) in order to make an impression, and show the necessity that did exist for the number of five separate courts in the city of Baltimore, produced statistics in order to prove the vast disproportion in the number of cases brought in the Baltimore city court over those cases brought in the different district courts of the State, as at present organized. He read, for that purpose, from a table of statistics prepared by the gentleman from Somerset, (Mr. Crisfield,) which gave an average of 1336 cases as the number of original suits brought in the Baltimore city court for the years 1845, '6, '7, '8, '9 and '50, and of course he was responsible only for what he read. It would be found that the average number of original suits was 1336, in the years 1845, '6, '7, and 1848, '9, and '50; and he believed they had four judges in Baltimore city. That was the average number brought in that district. When the honorable gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. Gwinn,) said that the district from which he, (Mr. B.,) came, was the